DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 203 CS 210 863

AUTHOR Chang, Tsan-Kuo
TITLE Access to the News and Foreign Policy: The Case of China, 1950-1984.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Information; Content Analysis; Foreign Countries; *Foreign Policy; Headlines; Information Dissemination; *Information Sources; International Relations; Mass Media; Media Research; Newspapers; *News Reporting; *Newswriting
IDENTIFIERS China; News Flow; New York Times; Washington Post

ABSTRACT

A study examined sources of information for articles appearing in the "New York Times" and the "Washington Post" on United States/China policy formation between the years 1950 to 1984 to determine what U.S. government agencies had access to the press in the democratic process. Two aspects of news access were examined: (1) sources of China policy or actors that appeared in the two newspapers, such as the White House or the Defense Department; and (2) the mode of the news source, such as speeches and interviews. Results showed that from 1950 to 1984, the executive branch of the government appeared to be the most dominant source in the policy-making process. Unnamed sources enjoyed fairly privileged access to the China policy news, suggesting that leaks and some other covert actions may have produced sources. However, as a forum of policy debate, Congress remained comparatively obscure in the newspapers' coverage. The newspapers also depended heavily upon news conferences and speeches as sources of information. The results suggest that the hierarchy of the foreign policy environment gives the President and his advisors substantial control over foreign policy initiative and places the executive branch above all other competing forces. (Twenty-seven notes and three tables are included.) (JC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED288203

Mass Communication Division

Access to the News and Foreign Policy: The Case of China, 1950-1984

Tsan-Kuo Chang
Department of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 687-4641

Paper presented at the 1987 convention of the Speech Communication Association, Boston, Massachusetts, November 5-8, 1987.

Tsan-Kuo Chang is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at Cleveland State University. This paper is part of his dissertation. The author wishes to thank Drs. Wayne A. Danielson and James W. Tankard for their valuable comments and suggestions throughout the preparation of the project.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tsan-Kuo Chang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 210 863

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Access to the News and Foreign Policy: The Case of China, 1950-84

Democratic theorists have long emphasized the importance of social or political pluralism in American democracy. Such pluralism serves, as Cobb and Elder put it, "to prevent any single group or interest from totally dominating the system."[1] In the democratic process, an obvious indicator of social pluralism is access to the news media. Politicians, students of politics and public opinion, and mass communication researchers have advocated the necessity of access to the press so that different ideas and opinions regarding policy issues, both foreign and domestic, can be fully discussed and put into perspectives.

The idea and ideal of access to the press is nothing new and can be traced back to the First Amendment. Many scholars have proposed that access to the press should be protected as a legal right for the individuals.[2] Basically, the rationale and arguments center around the public consent of popular government or the notion of government by the people. Graber indicated that "without access to the media, the individuals may be doomed to political ineffectiveness"[3] and are thus unable to make their voices heard. Barron argued that informed public opinion "requires that the public, through newspapers and broadcasts, have access to all shades of opinions."[4] Sigal agreed, suggesting that "access to the press, in particular to the principal national suppliers of news such as the Times and the Post, is essential if freedom of expression is to have any meaning."[5]

In the arena of public affairs, access to the press could have implications for policy discussion among the public and decision making

within the government. From a long term perspective, for example, political messages from a dominant news source may be perceived and legitimized as the only acceptable source of information and opinions in society. According to Barron, "access to the media is important because it gives men a sense of the legitimacy of existing institutions."[6]

One measure of access to the press is the examination of news sources. The attribution of news sources not only indicates where reporters obtain information and opinions in their newsgathering activities, but also represents the access of various political and social forces to the news media. Such access of course depends on the willingness of the news media to accord individuals and groups a place on the air or on the pages.[7] Because of the limited time and space provided by the media, it is apparent that "for every source included, another is excluded."[8] Accordingly, some researchers considered news sources as "the best available measure of influence on news coverage."[9] Others regarded sources as "crucial because most stories recount what someone says occurred, not what actually occurred."[10] In short, the news media's orientation to select sources (e.g., who is to speak and what they are allowed to say) constitutes "an important element in shaping the range and impact of opinion that gets expressed publicly."[11]

The purpose of this paper is to examine access to the news in the democratic process by focusing on one particular dimension--foreign policy making--within the context of U.S.-China policy over the past three decades. Use of a single policy case does not, of course, warrant a broad generalization of the findings to other policy issues. Within a longitudinal framework,

however, it provides the necessary context for analysis,[12] which may be lost otherwise.

Methods

China policy news was defined as news and opinions concerning U.S. relations with both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China on Taiwan (hereafter Taiwan). The study period covered thirty-five years, from 1950, the first full year after the People's Republic was founded in Peking in October 1949, through 1984, the end of President Reagan's first term.

Front page news and editorials were selected from the New York Times and the Washington Post.[13] The two newspapers were chosen because of their prominence and influences in and out of Washington.[14] In the case of the Times, some researchers argue that it "ends up influencing the content" of other mass media[15] and that it "may not be a bad indicator of the general thrust of news" that reaches the U.S. citizenry.[16]

The paragraph in the newspaper items was the coding unit with the whole item as the context unit. The whole item was too broad for the study and the paragraphs could, of course, be used as "cues or indicators"[17] of the overall content for the items. All paragraphs coded in the same year--the unit of analysis--were aggregated and transformed into percentages based on the frequency distribution of paragraphs in a given category. Each category then became a new variable with the percentage as its value.[18]

Two aspects of news access were examined in this study: first, sources of China policy, or actors that appeared in the two newspapers; and second, the mode of news source, or the "level of access" accorded to the actors.[19] Source of China policy was aimed at measuring the origin of the ideas, measures and actions concerning U.S.-China relations. The following actors or sources were coded: the White House, State Department/diplomats, Department of Defense/military, the Congress, Department of Commerce/Treasury, Justice/Court, civilians/groups, foreign governments/officials, China/Chinese officials, presidential candidates, former officials, Taiwan, unnamed sources, and others.

The mode of news sources was aimed at measuring the channels, formal or informal, through which U.S.-China policy was delivered to the public via the two newspapers. The following channels were coded: speeches, public announcements, press releases, news conferences, interviews, and messages to Congress, including congressional hearings, debates and the like. Hackett suggested that these different modes "constitute a descending hierarchy of access."[20] Higher modes (e.g., speeches or news conferences) may convey to the audience "different degrees of authoritativeness" or provide "greater opportunity for a source purposefully to set the agenda of a news story" than do lower modes (e.g., interviews).[21] The reason is simple: the former allows more control over the content and format of statements and invites less intervention by journalists.

Results

As discussed earlier, use of news sources not only reflects the orientation bias of the news media, but also indicates the degree of access to the news by different individuals and groups in society. Table 1 reports the sources of U.S.-China policy as they appeared in the front page news of the New York Times and the Washington Post. Because of their "definite attempts...to influence public opinion by either interpreting the news in a certain way or by arguing for a particular stand on a controversial question,"[22] editorials were included in the analysis as one of the sources.

News Sources of U.S.-China Policy

In the China policy making process, access to the front pages of the two newspapers seemed to be a function of the structure of U.S. foreign policy environment. With the powers of foreign policy initiative,[23] the executive branch of government appeared to enjoy more access to the China policy news than did other competing political forces such as the Congress over the past 35 years. Other governmental institutions such as the Defense Department and the military establishment were barely recognizable. As peripheral participants at best in the process,[24] groups, civilians, business, and organizations were for the most part denied access to the front pages of the two papers in their coverage of U.S.-China policy.

From 1950 through the late 1960s, when there was no direct contact between the United States and China, officials at the State Department and American diplomats appeared to be the leading sources of

U.S.-China policy news in the New York Times and the Washington Post. Congress also gained substantial access to the front pages as a major source of China policy during the bitter debate of "Who lost China?" in the early 1950s and again during the last few years of 1960s when the Johnson administration got deeply entangled in the Vietnam War. In march 1966 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held for the first time a month long hearings on U.S. policy toward China. Except for a brief period in 1966 when a distinguished panel of China scholars and experts testified before the Senate hearings, civilians, groups and other institutions were mostly invisible in the news throughout the three decades of U.S.-China policy making. Defense and military sources were given space on the front pages of the two newspapers when regional and international conflicts involved the United States and China, such as the Korean War in the early 1950s and the Vietnam War in the late 1960s as well as the confrontations in the Taiwan Strait crises.

Following the thaw of Sino-American relations in the early 1970s and until 1984, the White House, including the president and his advisers, gained more access to the front pages of the two papers' coverage of China policy than did other sources. Such high visibility of the White House was largely related to three presidential trips to China and the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. Nixon surprised the whole world in 1971 by announcing that he would personally go to China, which he did in early 1972. Ford went to China in 1975, shortly before the 1976 presidential election. In 1978-79, Carter completed Nixon s opening to China by establishing diplomatic relations with the Peking regime and at the same

time withdrawing all official ties with the Nationalist regime on Taiwan. Before his reelection, Reagan visited China in 1984. During the first year of his presidency, defense and military sources were also highly visible in the China policy news as the Reagan administration sought to discuss possible sales of U.S. arms to China.

Unlike the first few years of the 1950s and the second half of the 1960s, during the last decade of Sino-American relations, Congress remained generally unseen in the China policy news, lagging far behind the executive branch in its access to the front page news of the two papers. In 1979 Congress emerged visibly as a major China policy news source when it expressed concern over the non-governmental relationship with Taiwan.

With regard to China and Taiwan as parties in Sino-American relations, the former enjoyed a disproportionately higher access than the latter to the front pages of the two newspapers' coverage of China policy. In fact, compared to some of the American sources, China appeared from time to time to have more access to the news over the past 35 years. Such frequent visibility undoubtedly suggests the importance of China as a world power in American thinking. As Newsweek put it, "for more than two decades, China has been out of sight but rarely out of mind."[25] On the other hand, Taiwan was essentially non-existent in the two papers' China policy news even during the first twenty years when the Nationalist government on Taiwan still represented China in the United States.

Of the domestic sources, the unnamed or unattributed sources, such as "a high ranking official," "an informed source," "a senior administration official," or "it was learned," gained noticeable access to the two papers

coverage of U.S.-China policy news throughout the study period. The fact that the unnamed officials constantly remained salient in the China policy news indicated the willingness of the two newspapers to accord them a place on the front pages.

Considering the editorials as a means of participation in policy making, the two newspapers turned out to be a major source of U.S.-China policy during the past three decades.

Modes of News Sources

Table 2 shows how the two newspapers obtained news and opinions concerning U.S.-China policy during the study period. Editorials were excluded from the analysis.

On the whole, news conferences appeared to be the most important mode in which U.S.-China policy statements were delivered over the past 35 years, followed by speeches and press releases. Congress as a debate forum in the China policy making process appeared to be mostly negligible. Except for a few years in the early 1950s and in the mid-1960s, messages to the Congress, including congressional debates, hearings, and resolutions, remained largely sporadic and insignificant. For the most part, interviews as a means of China policy dissemination were less important than other modes.

The fact that officials from the executive branch dominated the front pages of the two papers' coverage of U.S.-China policy suggests that the two newspapers relied significantly on channels selected by the White House and the State Department to report issues and activities that involved the United States, China and Taiwan. This is particularly true during the Korean war in the early 1950s, the Taiwan Strait crises in 1955 and 1958, and the

normalization period of Sino-American relations in the first half of the 1970s.

For the foreign policy makers, use of different channels to deliver policy statements could have important implications and may serve to achieve policy goals. For one thing, the higher modes of access (e.g., news conferences and speeches) may provide policy makers with greater opportunity to manage how and when a policy issue is to be covered by the news media than a lower mode (e.g., interviews). As reported in Table 3, it is apparent that in the U.S.-China policy making process higher modes of access, especially news conferences, constituted the leading channels in which China policy statements were transmitted to the public via the news.

The two newspapers also reported U.S.-China policy in a way that did not clearly specify the methods of newsgathering. While some of the reports might be an artifact of news reporting (e.g. the omission of the how element in newswriting), in view of the highly visible unnamed or unattributed sources in Table 1, it seems more plausible that such coverage might involve leaks, background information and other non-public approaches. Given the fact that non-attribution has become a well accepted ground rule in the reporter-official interaction, the consistent occurrence of unspecified news modes throughout the 35 years seemed to suggest that certain sources, mostly the anonymous officials, gained substantial access to the front pages of the two newspapers and made known their views of U.S.-China policy behind the closed doors.

Conclusion and Discussion

From 1950 through 1984, the executive branch of the government appeared to be the dominant source in the U.S.-China policy making process. Congress, individuals, groups, and other governmental agencies were in no position to compete with the White House and the State Department in their access to the front page news of the New York Times and the Washington Post. As can be expected, the unnamed sources enjoyed a relatively privileged access to the China policy news. Of the two Chinese rivals, mainland China was accorded a disproportionately greater access to the front pages of the two papers than the Nationalist China on Taiwan.

Throughout the 35 years, in their coverage of China policy news, the two newspapers depended largely on news conferences and speeches, the higher modes of access, for statements on U.S.-China relations. The unspecified mode of access to the China policy news also appeared highly visible, suggesting that leaks and some other behind-the-door techniques may have been used by sources, most likely the unnamed, to deliver their messages. As a forum of policy debate, Congress remained comparatively obscure in the two newspapers' coverage of U.S.-China policy.

While interpretations of the results based on a single policy issue must be done with caution, findings from the longitudinal analysis may have theoretical implications. First, the data suggest the importance and the power of the executive branch in the U.S. foreign policy making process. The White House and the State Department are essentially the root sources for American foreign policy statements. Specifically, access to the foreign policy

news appears to be mostly limited to governmental officials, particularly those responsible for policy making in the executive branch. As a result, key policy makers may define the parameters of public discussion and debate over foreign affairs issues. Second, the dependence of the newspapers on pre-planned channels such as news conferences and speeches for foreign policy information and opinions gives policy makers an upper hand in their dealings with journalists. Through news management, policy officials are likely to set the agenda of news coverage of foreign affairs issues.

Within the foreign policy environment, several factors may account for the limited access to foreign policy news and the opportunity for policy makers to manage news. First, the hierarchy of the foreign policy environment gives the president and his advisers substantial control over foreign policy initiative and places the executive branch above all other competing forces.[26] Second, the unobtrusive nature of policy making, particularly when secrecy is involved,[27] requires that the number of participants in the making of foreign policy be reduced to a minimum and limited to only those top-ranking, responsible officials. Because of the structure of policy making, pluralism in the domain of foreign policy affairs seems to be unattainable, if not impossible.

Notes

[1] Roger W. Cobb and Charles D. Elder, Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), pp. 162-163.

[2] See, for example, Jerome A. Barron, Freedom of the Press for Whom? The Right of Access to Mass Media (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973); and Benno C. Schmidt Jr., Freedom of the Press vs. Public Access (New York: Praeger, 1976).

[3] Doris A. Graber, Mass Media and American Politics (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1980), p. 90.

[4] Jerome A. Barron, Freedom of the Press for Whom? p. 16.

[5] Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973), p. 193.

[6] Barron, Freedom of the Press for Whom? p. 79.

[7] J. Herbert Altschull, Agents of Power: The Role of the News Media in Human Affairs (New York: Longman, 1984), p. 133

[8] W. Lance Bennett, News: The Politics of Illusion (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 27.

[9] Montague Kern, Patricia W. Levering, and Ralph B. Levering, The Kennedy Crises: The Press, the Presidency, and Foreign Policy (Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Press, 1983), p. 237.

[10] David L. Paletz and Robert M. Entman, Media, Power, Politics (New York: The Free Press, 1981), p. 20.

11 Stephen Kline, quoted in Robert A. Hackett, "A Hierarchy of Access: Aspects of Source Bias in Canadian TV News," Journalism Quarterly 62: 256-265, 277 (Summer 1985).

12 Alex S. Edelstein, Comparative Communication Research (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1982), p. 19.

13 Indexes of the two newspapers were used to search for front page news and editorial items. The proportion of agreement between the index and the newspaper was unity for the Washington Post (1.00) and near perfect for the New York Times (0.98).

14 See, for example, Bernard C. Cohen, "The Present and the Press," World Politics 13 (October 1960): 173; W. Phillips Davison, "Mass Communication and Diplomacy," in World Politics, eds. James N. Rosenau, Kenneth W. Thompson, and Gavin Boyd (New York: The Free Press, 1976), pp. 389-390; Carol H. Weiss, "What America's Leaders Read?" Public Opinion Quarterly 38 (Spring 1974): 5; Barry Rubin, "The Press in Its Own Image," Washington Quarterly 2 (Spring 1979): 46; Edmund B. Lambeth, "Perceived Influence of the Press on Energy Policy Making," Journalism Quarterly 55 (Spring 1978): 12; Doris A. Graber, Mass Media and American Politics (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1980), p. 245; and Charlotte Saikowski, "Reagan Reading List: 'Coolidge' to 'Hondo,'" Christian Science Monitor, December 29, 1983, p. 4.

15 Todd Gitlin, The Whole World Is Watching (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), p. 299.

16 Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro, "Presidents as Opinion Leaders: Some New Evidence," Policy Studies Journal 12 (June 1984): 651.

17 Richard W. Budd, Robert K. Thorp and Lewis Donohew, Content Analysis of Communications (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967), p. 34.

18 The average intercoder agreements among the principal coder and two additional coders for the two variables under study were .74 for sources of China policy and .71 for modes of access. Because of the relatively large number of categories (15 for sources and 8 for modes) and coding decisions (944 paragraphs), the reliability coefficients were considered satisfactory.

For other variables not reported here, the reliability coefficients were much higher, ranging from .73 to .95.

19 Robert A. Hackett, "A Hierarchy of Access: Aspects of Source Bias in Canadian TV News," Journalism Quarterly 62: 256-265, 277 (Summer 1985).

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Clarence Schettler, Public Opinion in American Society (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), p. 210.

23 Wayne Ayres Wilcox, "The Foreign Policy of the United States," in World Politics, eds. James N. Rosenau, Kenneth W. Thompson and Gavin Boyd (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p. 37.

24 John Spanier and Eric M. Uslaner, How American Foreign Policy Is Made? (New York: Praeger, 1978), p. 91.

25 "An Open Door, a People Dimly Seen," Newsweek, February 21, 1972, p. 40.

26 Aaron Wildavsky, "The Two Presidencies," in Perspectives on the Presidency, ed. Aaron Wildavsky (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), pp. 448-461; and Spanier and Uslaner, How American Foreign Policy Is Made? p. 49.

27 See, for example, David Wise, The Politics of Lying: Government Deception, Secrecy, and Power (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), pp. 196-238.

Table 1: Sources of U.S.-China Policy, 1950-1984

Year	White House[1]	State Dept[2]	Defense/ Military	Congress[3]	Commerce/ Treasury	Civilians/[4] Groups	Foreign[5]
50	9.2%	26.4%	4.8%	12.3%	1.2%	2.5%	6.0%
51	4.7	20.4	16.2	14.1	-	0.2	5.9
52	3.3	4.6	4.6	15.1	7.9	2.0	0.7
53	12.2	12.4	7.3	25.6	-	0.4	8.0
54	9.4	24.9	2.4	15.6	-	1.8	6.0
55	9.7	22.1	1.8	19.1	0.3	2.2	3.0
56	7.7	22.2	-	2.0	-	-	3.4
57	0.2	34.9	1.4	7.7	0.2	2.8	0.7
58	12.0	27.9	5.9	3.2	-	1.0	5.0
59	2.1	35.2	-	2.8	-	6.6	4.9
60	19.5	10.1	-	6.2	-	3.6	1.3
61	15.6	16.8	1.2	4.5	-	1.0	2.5
62	17.1	11.5	-	0.4	-	2.0	5.6
63	5.6	24.6	-	-	-	2.4	-
64	5.5	19.0	5.5	0.4	-	-	4.7
65	2.5	16.0	7.4	-	-	-	7.0
66	6.6	15.4	4.7	8.9	-	16.5	0.5
67	9.3	8.8	4.6	14.8	0.5	-	-
68	10.7	0.9	4.5	11.6	-	3.6	-
69	7.4	28.3	-	12.3	-	-	0.9
70	10.0	19.5	3.2	5.4	-	-	1.1
71	23.5	11.9	0.3	4.9	0.3	6.0	6.1
72	35.6	4.9	1.1	4.9	0.6	2.3	4.6
73	21.9	16.5	0.4	1.0	0.4	4.8	0.6
74	6.3	21.2	-	13.1	3.1	1.2	-
75	20.9	23.1	0.2	0.5	-	1.9	-
76	9.2	4.9	1.2	1.8	-	7.3	-
77	6.8	16.4	1.2	4.4	-	1.2	-
78	26.9	11.1	0.7	5.4	0.6	5.4	1.6
79	20.2	7.9	1.4	10.1	4.3	5.8	0.7
80	3.7	9.9	15.2	2.2	-	6.8	-
81	8.9	22.9	1.2	1.2	-	0.7	4.1
82	15.7	16.8	0.2	6.0	2.1	1.1	-
83	8.7	16.8	4.7	0.2	1.2	4.5	-
84	44.0	2.1	0.9	0.4	-	3.7	3.3
Total	14.0%	18.1%	3.2%	8.4%	0.6%	3.3%	3.4%

1 This category includes president, vice president, and advisers to the president.
2 This category includes State Department officials and diplomats.
3 This category includes U.S. Senators and Representatives.
4 This category includes civilians, experts, groups, organizations, and business.
5 This category includes foreign governments, officials and press.

Table 1: (Continued)

Year	China	Press	Candidates[6]	Former[7] Officials	Taiwan	Justice/ Court	Unnamed	Other	N*
50	7.7%	18.9%	-	2.0%	1.7%	-	6.9%	0.4%	1660
51	4.6	20.1	-	0.7	1.5	0.5	10.5	0.6	988
52	7.2	33.6	0.7	-	4.6	10.5	5.3	-	152
53	1.1	20.9	-	0.4	1.1	-	10.4	-	450
54	8.3	21.6	-	-	0.5	-	9.1	-	881
55	8.4	19.7	-	0.3	0.7	0.8	11.1	0.7	2605
56	26.1	27.8	0.3	-	0.6	1.7	7.4	0.9	352
57	9.1	32.3	-	-	0.9	-	9.9	-	573
58	4.2	21.3	-	0.6	3.1	-	15.7	-	1797
59	10.1	27.2	-	-	-	-	9.8	1.4	287
60	2.0	20.5	31.6	-	1.3	-	2.9	1.0	307
61	10.6	23.0	-	0.7	8.2	-	13.1	2.7	404
62	8.7	23.8	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.4	26.6	-	252
63	13.5	19.8	-	-	-	-	34.1	-	126
64	9.1	28.5	0.4	-	-	-	26.5	0.4	253
65	28.4	25.5	-	-	-	-	10.7	2.5	243
66	15.9	17.2	-	1.1	-	-	13.1	0.2	1014
67	12.0	26.9	-	4.2	-	-	19.0	-	216
68	18.8	27.7	1.8	-	-	-	18.8	1.8	112
69	8.3	29.4	-	0.6	0.6	-	12.3	-	350
70	9.5	31.5	-	-	0.9	-	18.8	-	441
71	9.1	23.7	-	0.3	3.0	-	10.3	0.5	1873
72	9.3	23.8	0.2	0.1	1.9	-	10.8	-	1134
73	8.4	25.5	-	-	0.6	-	20.0	-	521
74	6.9	28.1	-	1.2	-	-	18.8	-	160
75	11.4	25.7	0.2	-	-	-	16.0	-	412
76	3.7	35.2	1.2	13.5	0.9	-	18.0	3.1	327
77	23.5	28.1	-	2.0	2.7	0.7	11.7	1.2	409
78	6.0	16.9	-	0.4	6.3	0.1	18.1	0.4	669
79	16.1	17.2	-	0.2	0.6	2.7	11.6	1.2	1023
80	15.2	9.6	19.5	0.6	0.6	0.3	15.2	1.2	323
81	8.9	19.5	-	7.0	3.9	-	18.8	2.9	415
82	25.7	16.0	0.2	0.9	0.4	-	14.3	0.6	470
83	30.0	15.1	-	-	-	1.4	17.3	-	423
84	14.9	19.8	-	-	-	-	10.9	0.2	571
Total	10.4%	21.9%	0.8%	0.9%	1.6%	0.4%	12.7%	0.5%	22193

6 This category includes presidential and vice-presidential candidates.
7 This category includes former presidents, vice-presidents, and other officials.
* Entries are number of paragraphs.

Table 2: Modes of News Sources, 1950-1984

Year	Press Release	News[1] Conference	Speech	Message[2] to Congress	Press[3]	Interview	Unknown	Non-domestic	N*
50	10.6%	15.1%	15.5%	10.4%	9.9%	2.6%	17.6%	18.4%	1387
51	11.9	10.6	13.3	25.1	3.3	2.0	19.0	14.8	796
52	14.7	7.8	6.9	8.8	3.9	6.9	32.4	18.6	104
53	7.9	16.6	3.9	17.7	9.8	9.0	22.5	12.5	356
54	11.8	27.1	5.9	7.1	9.7	2.4	17.2	18.8	709
55	6.2	21.0	6.3	13.2	13.8	4.3	20.8	14.4	2166
56	15.5	12.5	7.2	-	9.1	3.8	11.7	40.2	264
57	10.2	20.1	9.0	3.6	14.7	8.3	19.4	14.7	422
58	12.1	25.6	7.6	0.1	10.8	2.7	25.9	15.2	1461
59	13.7	23.2	11.4	10.0	4.7	1.4	15.2	20.4	211
60	10.0	11.7	37.8	0.4	12.2	5.2	16.5	6.1	230
61	3.5	9.1	8.8	13.5	19.6	-	20.2	25.2	341
62	3.6	15.5	4.6	-	11.9	1.0	43.8	19.6	194
63	1.0	3.8	23.8	-	5.7	2.9	46.7	16.2	105
64	10.8	10.2	5.4	-	7.5	-	47.3	18.8	186
65	4.2	2.6	16.8	-	8.4	-	19.9	48.2	191
66	9.4	7.3	11.2	22.2	5.9	6.4	18.5	19.2	865
67	7.8	10.0	8.9	7.8	21.7	2.2	27.2	14.4	180
68	3.6	4.8	26.2	-	9.5	2.4	28.6	25.0	84
69	5.8	21.5	18.9	3.6	20.7	0.4	16.7	12.4	275
70	1.9	16.6	2.5	4.4	29.1	2.8	28.5	14.1	361
71	3.3	25.0	5.2	1.2	18.8	4.6	20.5	21.5	1593
72	2.0	18.5	4.9	3.3	28.2	4.6	19.8	18.7	958
73	1.3	22.6	3.9	-	30.8	6.5	24.3	10.8	465
74	4.4	11.0	2.9	-	36.0	14.0	23.5	8.1	136
75	2.3	21.4	7.4	-	32.3	1.4	21.7	13.4	350
76	0.8	9.5	6.2	4.1	24.1	6.6	42.3	6.2	241
77	1.2	5.3	16.9	0.3	21.3	3.0	26.3	31.7	338
78	0.8	9.0	4.1	-	19.1	14.7	37.0	15.2	611
79	4.5	8.4	8.3	4.9	18.7	9.7	26.4	19.2	920
80	2.6	29.6	6.9	3.0	13.8	2.6	24.7	16.8	304
81	0.6	26.6	3.3	0.6	18.6	8.3	22.7	19.4	361
82	6.2	6.9	7.9	2.1	14.8	6.7	31.2	29.3	420
83	1.5	8.0	1.5	-	14.7	3.6	38.0	32.6	389
84	1.2	3.5	12.3	-	28.1	6.9	25.5	20.6	306
Total	6.4%	16.7%	8.4%	6.5%	15.7%	4.7%	23.3%	18.4%	18478

1 This category includes briefings and erchanges with reporters.
2 This category includes congressional debates, hearings, and resolutions.
3 This category refers to reporter's observations.
* Entries are number of paragraphs on the front pages. Missing values were excluded.

Table 3: Modes by News Sources*

Modes	White House	State Dept	Defense/ Military	Congress	Commerce/ Treasury	Civilians/ Groups	Justice/ Court
Press release	10.8%	14.4%	21.1%	7.0%	5.0%	13.6%	17.1%
News conference	45.8	39.6	25.1	9.4	29.0	10.2	9.8
Speeches	14.6	21.6	8.4	9.0	14.0	9.1	22.0
Messages to Congress	3.4	5.4	17.3	36.2	1.0	25.1	0.0
Interviews	5.4	3.5	8.1	18.2	5.0	17.9	7.3
Unspecified	19.9	15.6	20.0	20.2	46.0	24.0	43.9
N =	2448	3543	654	1715	100	625	82

* Other sources are not reported.